

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

The Office is thanked for considering the rule 181 petition and for withdrawing the finality of the previous official action.

The claims 10, 15, 19 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 10 and 15 has been amended to obviate the rejection.

Claim 19 is canceled to obviate the rejection.

Claim 26 is amended to depend from claim 22 and to include clearer antecedent.

Claim 27 has also been amended in a similar way.

Claims 6-9, 11-14, 16, 18-19, and 22-32 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Fisher. Claims 2, 10 and 15 stand rejected as allegedly being obvious over Fisher in view of Powell.

Claims 8 and 22 has been amended to obviate this rejection. Nonelected claims 34-64 are canceled. Claims 65-69 are submitted which also avoid the rejection for similar reasons to those previously discussed.

Specifically, Fisher shows a system for buying products over the Internet. One of the possibilities is a bidding system. As the official action points out, column 6 of Fisher from lines 46-67, describes that an e-mail notification can be used to "allow the bidder to enter a new bid by replying to the electronic mail message and sending it back to the system". The specific technique of Fisher, however, uses a form in the message, so that one part of that form in the message, when responded to, can include a new bid.

Claim 8, however, has been amended to include the subject matter previously described in paragraph 20, whereby keyword recognition is used to recognize information in an e-mail. According to claim 8, an information determining part receives e-mail messages and obtain information from those messages in a form that can interact with the webpage. The information determining part has "a keyword recognition system which recognizes at least one word in the e-mail to determine automatically a desired action of the e-mail without requiring special form from the e-mail...".

Such subject matter is not disclosed by Fisher, and produces a significant advantage over Fisher's requirement of using a specific form. According to claim 8, any desired e-mail can be sent, because the keyword recognition system recognizes one word in the e-mail that can be used to indicate the subject of the e-mail. Fisher requires that a specific form be used. Claim 8, in contrast, describes that by recognizing at least one word in the e-mail, different actions can be taken. The effect is that since words are recognized, this obviates the need to use a specific and specialized form for this operation.

Therefore, claim 8 should be allowable for these reasons along with the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 6 specifies that one of the words being reviewed for by the keyword detector is the word "bid". None of the prior art describes detecting the word "bid", and taking an action based on detecting that word. Hence, claim 6 is even further allowable.

Claims 2, 10 and 15 were rejected based on Fisher in view of Powell. Powell describes a system for carrying out programming based on plaintext requests. Powell,

however, describes this being used for programming, rather than, as claimed, for purchasing of items.

For example, claim 10 requires a session indicator that "takes action on a specified auction based on said session identification indicator". Nothing in the cited prior art discloses this subject matter.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the session ID is a unique value that unambiguously represents an item to be bid on. Again, nothing in the cited prior art discloses or suggests this subject matter. Specifically, claim 12 defines that the session ID is a unique value that unambiguously represents an item to be bid on. Nothing in the cited prior art describes anything that could be a session ID, used as part of e-mail messages, and that unambiguously represent an item to be bid on. Therefore, claim 12 should be additionally allowable for these reasons.

Claim 22 has been amended to define a keyword recognition system that recognizes at least one word in the e-mail, to automatically determine the desired action of the e-mail without requiring a special form. This should be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above.

Claim 26 defines that the keyword recognition system automatically recognizes phrases that have the word "bid", and should be additionally allowable for reasons discussed above.

Claim 65 defines a Web server with an information part that receives e-mail messages and automatically determines information from those messages in a form that can interact with a web page, wherein the keyword recognition system recognizes at least phrases that include the word "bid" in the e-mail to determine automatically that

a bid action is being requested by the e-mail. Nothing in the cited prior art is in any way suggestive of this subject matter.

For all of these reasons, all of these claims should be allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Therefore, and in view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claim should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/20/2009

      /Scott C Harris/        
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. DIY-C1/SCH  
Serial No.: 10/064,439

Customer No. 23844  
Scott C. Harris, Esq.  
P.O. Box 927649  
San Diego, CA 92192  
Telephone: (619) 823-7778  
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717